

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT TACOMA

8 MICHAEL AMES,

9 Plaintiff,

v.

10 MARK LINDQUIST, et al.,

11 Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-5090 BHS

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

12  
13 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Mark Lindquist, Mark and  
14 Chelsea Lindquist, and Pierce County's ("Defendants") motion for reconsideration. Dkt.  
15 71.

16 On January 31, 2018, the Court denied Defendants' motion to stay pending appeal  
17 concluding in part that Plaintiff Michael Ames has asserted allegations to support each  
18 claim that are not subject to immunity defenses. Dkt. 68. On February 14, 2018,  
19 Defendants filed a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 71. Defendants contend that the  
20 Court's conclusion is in error "because the issues on appeal are inextricably linked with  
21 all aspects of the case against Prosecutor Lindquist . . . ." *Id.* at 2. The Court agrees that  
22 some issues may be intertwined, but, at this point, it appears that the majority of issues

1 are not inextricably linked. Moreover, the Court notes that the experienced counsel  
2 representing both sides should be able to delineate the bounds of discovery in a  
3 professional manner without Court intervention.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the Court **DENIES**  
4 Defendants' motion for reconsideration.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated this 22nd day of February, 2018.

7  
8   
9 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 <sup>1</sup> In the parties' joint status report Defendants' request a scheduling conference to address  
22 lingering discovery issues. Dkt. 72 at 6. The Court denies the request because it is unaware of  
any discovery issues given that discovery has been stayed pending the resolution of Defendants'  
motion to dismiss.